THE WESTERN LUMINARY.

"THE LAMB IS THE LIGHT THEREOF."—Rev. xxi. 23.

VOL. I.] LEXINGTON, KY. APRIL 20, 1825. [No. XLI.

EDITED BY

J. Breckinridge & J. C. Harrison.

PRINTED BY

THOMAS T. SKILLMAN.

Published every Wednesday, at THREE DOLLARS per annum, in the currency of Kentucky, in advance, and increasing by TWENTY-FIVE CENTS for every three months delay.

CORRESPONDENCE

Between Doct. Caldwell and J. Breckinridge.

LEXINGTON, *Saturday*, Jan. 29, 1825.

My dear Sir:—Dr. Fishback, has informed me, that he received from Mr. Gratz, the following statement, as coming from yourself, viz:—"Mr Breckinridge says, that he has formed a coalition with Dr. Fishback, in opposition to the University."

When we last conversed on this general subject, (you must remember,) I carefully avoided mentioning any names; and that even when requested by you. I did then declare, as I now believe, that the estrangement of the Christian denominations of the west from the present administration of the University, was becoming general and decided; and among these, I mentioned the Baptist Church especially. But you are aware, that Dr. Fishback's name was not mentioned in our conversion; and as it was in part, upon the propriety and duty of avoiding implication as to the opinions of individuals not expressed, you cannot, I am persuaded, have so soon departed from the principles then advanced.

I write these few lines, more to do justice to Dr. Fishback and yourself, than from any consideration connected with myself. I feel myself confederate with all who honestly oppose the spread of fatal error, wherever it is found. But there has been in no sense or way any union or understanding between Dr. Fishback and myself on this subject.

You will confer a favour on me, by an answer, containing an explanation of the misunderstanding alluded to above.

I remain respectfully your ob't serv't,

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

LEXINGTON, Jan. 27th, 1825.

My dear Sir:—In reply to your very polite note of the present date, which I found a few minutes ago on my table, permit me to say, that, as far as it goes, the statement it contains respecting the conversation which I had lately the pleasure of holding with you on the administration and character of Transylvania University, is substantially correct.—Other topics were introduced, but not such as are material to the object of your communication.

You stated to me specifically, that ever since your return from the East, you had done every thing in your power to "*put down*" (such I think, were the terms you used) the President of the University; that you considered it your duty to continue your efforts to the same effect; and that, if you had "*five hundred sons*" you you would, in imitation of the father of Hannibal, compel them all to swear—"if, you added, it were not a sin to swear"—to follow your example of active and unremitting hostility.

You further observed, that a combined attack was about to be opened on the President (for his destruction was represented, I think, as the sole object of the united effort) of such force, as must inevitably *overwhelm*, *crush*, or *destroy* him. One of these three strong terms was employed to express what you anticipated as the indubitable issue of the impending conflict.

As *allies* or *parties* in this combination, you distinctly mentioned the *Presbyterian* and *Baptist* denominations of Chris-

tians, but no individual was designated as leading or belonging to either of them.

During our conversation, which lasted about an hour, and in which, towards its close, the Reverend Mr. ——— joined, I do not remember that the name of Dr. Fishback was once mentioned. When I asked, whether you could do me the favour to name the individual or individuals who had communicated to you a certain report to which reference was made, you declined, observing, that you did not feel yourself justified in being so personal.

This, if I mistake not, is, in substance, a correct view of that part of our conversation, to which your note invites my attention.

In relation to the general subject of it, allow me cherish the hope, that a few remarks, dictated in a spirit of perfect concilation, will not be misconstrued, nor otherwise received by you that in friendly part.

It is our happy lot to live at a period of the world enlightened greatly beyond those that have preceded it; and to reside in a country, the spirit of whose institutions, ecclesiastical and civil, is marked, not barely by *tolerance*, but by perfect *liberality*, *benovolence*, and *charity*. The very term persecution is offensive to us in its sound, and nothing is so odious as the practice which it designates.

Permit me, then, respectfully to suggest to you, whether, when the feelings are excited and enthusiasm awakened, even in what may be considered the best of causes, it is easy for those concerned, especially as leaders, among whose motives to action (such is the frailty of human nature) some degree of personality is too apt to conceal itself—whether, I say under such circumstances, it is easy to decide correctly, at what point *righteous opposition* to supposed or real *error* ends, *unrighteous persecution* of those to whom the error is imputed *begins*? is not the most pure minded individual, when heated by intellectual conflict, especially in behalf of a favourite topic, in great danger of transferring some portion of his indignation from the alleged error or crime to him who is charged with the commission of it?

From the period of the crusades to the present moment, some part of Christendom has been perpetually shocked by scenes of persecution on account of religion, the actors in which have been *honest at heart*, but most deplorably *astray in their intellect*.

Man in the west is the same imperfect being with the man in the east, and enthusiasm, a power no less delusive in the United States, than it is in Italy, Portugal, or Spain.

Suffer me to hope, that these suggestions may be worthy of your consideration, and to offer you an assurance of the sentiments of perfect respect with which I have the honour to be,

Dear Sir, your very faithful and
Obedient servant,
CH: CALDWELL.

P. S. In communicating to President Holley the substance of our late conversation, I must have introduced *inadvertently* the name of Dr. Fishback, in such a way, as to induce him to believe that he had been designated by you as one of a confederacy against the University. For that inadvertency I owe *you* the apology, which I thus frankly entreat you to accept. The first virtue is not to commit a fault, the second promptly and liberally to atone for it.

In the mean time, Dr. Fishback's own manifestation of hostility to the University and its best interests, is much more condemnatory of him than any expression of mine, whether dropt by accident or design. Nor can all his sophistry wipe from him the charge of *virtual* hostility to the *town of Lexington*. C. C.

Further—You asserted *confidently* that the Baptists would unite with the Presbyterians in opposition to the University. Such an association I felt persuaded you would not make without good cause—not without positive *information to that effect*. Dr. Fishback leads the Baptist society in this place, you, the leader of the Presbyterians, often meet him and converse with him. For *two leaders* thus situated, and engaged in the same enterprize, to *understand each other*, is so *natural* and politic, that nothing short of *your own* declaration to the contrary could persuade me that you and the Dr. had not communicated your views to each other, and weighed your means.

In further explanation of this affair, permit me to observe, that long previously to the time of the conversation I held with you, I had been perfectly satisfied of Dr. Fishback's latent hostility to Tran-

sylvania University.—I had, moreover, good reason to believe, that he meditated making, at no distant day, the attack which he has since commenced. For these rensons, when you spoke of the Baptist denomination as about to join the combination against the institution, I frankly declare to you that I considered the Dr. and his friends refered to, although they were not named. It was therefore, that I afterwards so constantly and strongly associated his name with the combination which you announced, as to speak of them at the same time.

LEXINGTON, Feb. 4th.

My dear Sir:—Your reply to my communication of last week was handed me on the eve of my departure to the country, and your note of invivation to the lecture room was not received until the address proposed had been delivered—otherwise it would have afforded me pleasure to have heard your explanation, &c. to the Medical Class.

I now hasten to say a few words, in reply to your statement of our conversation. Before doing this, however, allow me to remark. that it was not the most courteous and kind return for the frankness with which I gave you my views on President Holley's character as a minister of the Gospel and a public teacher, to go and communicate to him, and *through him* to the public, a conversation which had been invited by yourself

It is understood to be a common rule in honorable and friendly intercourse—in making the use you did of *such remarks*, to give before hand to the author an intimation of one's purpose. For my own part, I did not only save you from being personal, when I decidedly refused to repeat, at *your request*, the name of one, (who you said) had slandered you, but have since that time. carefully avoided connecting your *strong* insinuations with the name of any individual When conversing, as I have often done on this subject since, I have uniformly avoided a designation of the *object* of your *remarks*, though we all must have understood to whom you alluded, and though you connected with the individual charges of slander and falsehood. But I can attribute your course to a deep interest in the person and peculiar principles of the President, and to a friendly desire to serve him without injuring me. And be assured that as to its effects on myself, I have nothing to fear or to lose from the President's displeasure. He has long known, so has all the world who chose, the views of the Lexington and of American Presbyterians concerning him. My objection here is to the manner of making them known. But with your permission, I have a fault to find, not only with the *method* of communication, but with the *matter* made *known*. You have done me injustice in the statements of the facts.—I pretend not of course to assail your motives. But there was not one word in our conversation said as to a confederacy between the Baptists and the Presbyterians *against* the University, or *for* it—such a junction of forces would have been *for* it, if formed at all, *for* its best interests—*for* the best interests of the town, state, and country; and they will very soon be seen by the town itself to be the *enemies* in *act*, though I would be far from saying in *purpose*, who have so long sustained the present incumbent on the Presidency. But I repeat it, no *combination* of any sort, or for any object, was mentioned. It was distinctly avowed that the Baptists were, it was believed, about to arise in the length and breadth of the land, to resist the corruptions of the President, and to attempt to put him down *as the author and diffuser of them*. In this I did and now do rejoice—and did then as I do now express my hearty gratification, at the visibly increasing estrangement of the leading christian denominations of the state, from the President and his system. But there was no intimation of any understanding on this subject, adjusting the principles of a common warfare against him. There never has been such a combination, though I see very well how the imagination or p etence of its existence, would at this solemn crisis in his affairs, excite the public pity—and, through the cry of persecution, crusades, and religious intolerance, bring back to his sinking hopes, the public aid.

Be assured, my dear Sir, there is no other union of these now *dreaded* denominations, one of which Mr. Holley said when he first came amongst us, that he would *unite* with himself, and the other *crush*,—no other union, than that they both have hearts to bleed for the injured public, and both a desire to see those in-

juries repaired. You must have inferred my meaning here too, therefore, as well as in reference to Dr. Fishback's name, your apology, in regard to which mistake, I herein acknowledge. Again, in my reference to the father of Hannibal, I spoke of enmity to the system of the President, and not to his person. I declare to you, that I have often tried to pray for his conversion, to a knowledge and a "love of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ."—His soul I love—his state I pity—his system, I, from my heart, abhor.

Allow me at the same time to say that I thank you for your counsel and admonition on this subject. In what spirit sover, (and I hope it was the most kind,) they were dictated, I shall strive to derive profit from them. I am neither so vain nor so ignorant of myself as to suppose that good advice is not much needed by me. While however I thank you for these suggestions, permit me in turn, respectfully to drop an unassuming intimation to you. "Great men," we are told in the S. S. "are not always wise," and they who are much conversant with books are often ignorant of men and things. Sometimes they are ignorant in spite of experience. You have not yet I think adopted the sentiments of the community at large, nor taken the most just views of the policy, the dignity and duty of the Medical School, if you would identify its prospects with those of any man; especially with the fate of one who is followed by the frowns of God, for having exchanged his service and love, for apostacy, scepticism and the praises of the world. He is perishing as a public teacher, he cannot stand, and you will I fear perish with him from the ranks of its professors, if you assume his attitude and attempt to inculcate his principles. The medical school is the pride and wonder of the west. It stands forth in the solitude of its own greatness, entirely independent on the fortunes of any man. When on a late occasion you drew your pen in defence of Mr. Holley's Theology, not only did the wise of your own, and the Medical School's friends exceedingly regret it, but the silence of some of its most distinguished professors, told us in a language which we could not misunderstand nor sufficiently commend, that they disapproved of the course you pursued on the occasion. They were without doubt, as deeply, (and I must think more intelligently) attached to the best interests of the college proper, as you could have been; as deeply to those of the town and of the country. Let us join them in a fervent regard for these high interests, but like them feel that the Medical School is great and firm, whether the President stand or whether he become extinct. They did not come here to teach us theology, or to interpret to us the *mysterious character* of imported Unitarians; but to instruct our sons in the important branches of the healing art. Perhaps you will esteem me too young to give you counsel, and too ignorant to make prophecies from experience of life and knowledge of men. But I venture to predict that if *not now*, at some not distant day, your disregard of these suggestions will cause you the most poignant regret, when regret will be of no avail.

It is my sincere wish that in this particular you may be yet enabled *as to yourself* to call me a *false prophet.*

With sentiments of respect,
I remain your ob't servant,
JOHN BRCEKINRIDGE.

LEXINGTON, Feb. 7th.

My Dear Sir:—Your very interesting letter of the 4th instant, with which you have had the kindness to favour me, embraces such a number and variety of important topics, that, pressed as I am with official business, leisure is not allowed me to invite your attention to the whole of them at present. It is my purpose, at no distant day, provided your consent can be obtained, and your convenience may permit, to hold with you, on the general ground of your communication, a frank conversation, whether alone or in the presence of friends.

In the mean time, suffer me to submit to your consideration a remark or two on a few points on which we differ not only in sentiment, but, I regret to say, in recollection.

By nothing in the nature or manner of our late conversation respecting Transylvania University, or in any of the circumstances connected with it, was secrecy or concealment either *enjoined* or *implied.* Every thing combined to render the facts stated and the feelings and opinions expressed *common property*, to be fairly used, at discretion, by any and eve-

ry individual present. And you have not, I am sure, forgotten that, during the greater part of the interview, there were in the room as speakers and listeners, four gentleman, Mrs. B. occasionally, and, I think, one or two servants. I am, therefore, encouraged to hope, that on a little further and more mature reflection, you will find good reason to revoke the charge you have hastily preferred against me of a breach of confidence, or any act of impropriety or indelicacy, in making to President Holley the communication I did, especially when you shall have been fully informed of the *manner in which* I did it, and the motives by which I was actuated on the occasion. For, I need not say to you, that the manner and motives constitute the most important portion of the act.

That in speaking of the opposition to President Holley, about to be made by the christians of the West *generally*, you specified by *name* the *Baptist* and *Presbyterian* denominations, is a point of which I am so thoroughly convinced, that I fear we shall have some difficulty in adjusting our recollections respecting it. Whether you employed the term *combination*, *union*, *confederacy*, or some other of *similar import*, I pretend not to remember. Nor is it a matter of the least moment. That the substance of your observation was as I have stated it, I do not despair of being able to call distinctly to your recollection.

But that your hostility to the President did not appear to me to be *personal*, but directed against him as a *public officer* and *instructor of youth*, I have done you the justice uniformly to declare. You observed at the time, as you do in your letter, that you had often prayed for him, or attempted so to do. In employing, therefore, the expression, "*crush*, *overwhelm*, or *destroy him*," I considered you as referring to his *public agency*

You again in your letter, as you did in our late conversation, allude to what you are pleased to call *my* "defence of Mr. Holley's theology," in a publication to which my name was attached last spring.

On this topic, indulge, me I pray you, in a few observations.

The paper alluded to contains *no defence of any system of theology*: But it does contain a very deep and condemnatory denunciation against any effort to contaminate the minds of the pupils of Transylvania University, by infusing into them the principles of infidelity.--It may be held doubtful, whether you have ever yourself, either publicly or privately, pronounced a denunciation of greater force. While I beg permission to invite your attention to it, allow me to say, that you will find it in the fourth page of the pamphlet alluded to.

If in a single sentence of that publication, there appears a shadow of defence of either immorality or irreligion, let me, as the supposed writer of it, be *held in infamy*. If, on the contrary, nothing such appears in it, you shall yourself pronounce sentence on its misinterpreters.

But admitting the pamphlet to contain and defend heretical sentiments, am *I alone* culpable? I, whose signature stands last, preceded by W. T. Barry L. L. D. &c. Jese Bledsoe L. L. D. &c. and B. W. Dudley M. D. &c! I repeat the question, am I alone culpable, and my associates innocent! If not, why are the fulminations of the offended directed exclusively at me!

Is this course pursued, by those whom I have never wronged, and in whose concerns I have never interfered, because I, being a *stranger* in the community, unsupported by family connexions and political associations, present the better marks for the shaft of an assailant! On these topics, and several others, it will be gratifying to me to converse with you frankly and fully, on a convenient occasion, as it is now, to renew to you the assurance of the sentiments of high regard, with which I have the honor to be

Dear Sir, your very faithful,
and obedient ser't.
CH'S CALDWELL.

LEXINGTON, Feb. 10th.

My Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 7th inst. in answer to my communication of the 4th, has been carefully and respectfully read. A reply in detail seems scarcely to be necessary. And yet to do justice to both of us, I have felt it a duty to re-examine the defence of Mr. Holley referred to, and to ascertain whether or not you (with whom I have here to do, though I by no means consider you single or superlative in this service, as your let-

ter intimates) have in that paper vindicated the President's theology, &c.

A critical analysis of it, is not here intended. I would however remark, that its avowed purpose is to defend Mr. Holley, as to his morals, literary qualifications, and theology. Whether the race-field, and circus, and ball room, &c. are places at which christian morals are best formed, or best exhibited; whether a professed preacher of righteousness is altogether in his place, when leading youth, committed to his care, into these scenes: whether the low estimation in which the President's literary attainments were held in Boston and New England, be any rule of judgment to us in the west, I need not here determine.

By a reference however to the 7th paragraph of that document, you will find that it is declared to be the "entire persuasion" of the authors, that "neither in his official capacity, nor in his familiar hours of social intercourse, has the President *ever* attempted to inculcate on his pupils, directly or indirectly, any opinion unfriendly to sound christianity;" while in the third paragraph it is said that the "writers are so intimately acquainted with him as to be fully qualified to judge." Surely, my dear sir, this is advocating his theology in very strong and unqualified terms. What his theology really is, need not here be said; but that it is not the system of belief that is held by the people of Kentucky, cannot be denied by any honest mind, acquainted with the subject. I would ask of you in confirmation of this assertion, whether two* of your medical professors did not decline the signature of that paper upon the ground that Mr. Holley "did not hold the religion of the state;" while the paper vindicated and commended his religion as "*sound* christianity."

In regard to the subject of your making known our conversation to the President, I meant not that it was *confidential*, but *personal;* and therefore it was improper to have repeated it to the person referred to, without giving notice to the other party. I am unwilling however to say more of this, and indeed am desirous to close our now protracted correspondence on these topics. With one or two additional suggestions, I shall cease to occupy your pen or eye in this way.

Your allusion to your personal situation is affecting. I should feel myself unworthy of the name of man, and much more christian man, if I could be influenced toward you, by the considerations to which you refer. You are aware that this interchange of views, was occasioned in a two fold sense by yourself: first, by your seeking the interview from which it arose; and, secondly, by your mistakes as to what passed between us, while together. That you are a stranger, your fellow citizens here, whom you have served for many years, cannot admit; and their exalting you to your present distinguished station, and faithfully sustaining you there, are strong evidences that they have not measured you by lineage, family influence or *political associations*.

"When you were a stranger we took you in." We the more ardently received you because we heard that you had risen by merit, not by party—by personal exertion, and not an illustrious heraldry. In the absence of a nearer kindred we opened to you the hearts of two millions of people; and bade you to repose in them, and give and take the blessing.

But if you shall have been found lightly to esteem our highest and only imperishable hope; to assail the citadel of our most precious truth, by which we live; or to *sustain* those who have thus requited our favours, I will not say that you ought to sink with them, but ask you, who will have most been injured? and who will have the better reason to complain?

I have in my possession a certificate of the Rev: William Henderson, who was present during our conversation, and will, if desired, transcribe it for you. He confirms entirely my statement.

With respect, your obed't serv't,
JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

Sir,

Unless your ostentatious devotion to what you would seem to consider the legitimate concerns of *another* world has swallowed up entirely your knowledge of *this*, particularly your knowledge of the human mind, I need scarcely inform you that your note of this morning communicating to me your determination to commit to the press our late correspondence, filled me at once with surprise and re-

* Four, of the six medical professors were thus related to this subject.

gret—surprise that an act, which, to say the least of it, is a flagrant violation of private confidence, should be meditated by an individual whose character is held sacred, and regret for the change of sentiment in relation to you, which your whole conduct is irresistibly producing in my mind.

Throughout your brief but unfortunate career, which has blighted so irrcoverably the fair and flattering promise of your youth, prevented your anticipated usefulness in your vocation, alienated from you the most enlightened and respectable of your parishoners, proved fatal to your good name as a minister of the gospel, been so unspeakably annoying to the good and peaceful citizens of this place, and, as far as you have been able to render it so, a barrier to the progress of letters in the West—During this course, so intemperate in its character, and so unsuitable to a *consecrated* follower of *Him* who was meek and lowly, and peaceful in spirit, I have often been your advocate in the midst of your condemners, have palliated faults in you which I could not justify, and endeavoured to persuade both myself and others, that time and experience would improve your judgment, moderate your temper, correct your errors, cure your indiscretions, meliorate your charities and affections as a christian, and render you yet an amiable man, and a worthy labourer in the vineyard of God.

But alas! the lamentable mistake into which I have fallen, is another proof, I fear, added to the hundreds before in existence, that I am no prophet. I perceive at last, but too clearly, that, like the faithless meteor in the traveller's path, my hopes and wishes have beguiled my judgment, and led me from the track which others who had long known you, and who therefore *knew you better*, pursued in safety.

Still I am not sorry that, for a time, I was deceived. As long as it lasted, the delusion was pleasing to me, and if it has been productive of mischief, it is only to myself. So peculiarly delightful to me is a kind and favourable opinion of my fellow-men, that, much and often as I have suffered by indulging it, I am perfectly willing to suffer more, rather than forego the gratification it affords, Rather let my eye be plucked from its socket, or rendered sightless within it, than thrown with cold suspicion and unmanly distrust on all who approach me.

Even in relation to yourself, much and painfully as my anticipations have been disappointed, I do not despair. There is in time and experience, correct example and salutary admonition, a healing influence and a redeeming power, to which hope still clings and will continue to cling, until her grasp shall be paralysed by the fatal conviction that every thing is lost.

Nor, unless compelled to it by circumstances beyond my control, will I *then* be found in the ranks of your accusers. *Covertly* and *insidiously*, I thank my God, I am no man's enemy, Nor, with my present feelings, is it possible I can ever become so. Should I hereafter appear as *your open* and *declared* enemy, and endeavour to inflict on you the slightest injury, the fault shall be your own. The act shall be either defensive, or in retaliation of some aggression on your part, for which, in the distribution of justice, and according to the settled and pronounced opinion of the enlightened and the virtuous, you shall deserve to suffer.

I have intimated to you that your conduct has compelled me to change my opinion of you. A few words will represent to you wherein, in one instance, this change consists.

In one of my letters to you, dated February 7th, 1825, I observe the following paragraph:

"But that your hostility to the Presi-
"dent" (the Reverend Mr. Holley) "did
"not appear to me to be *personal*, but di-
"rected against him as *a public officer* and
"*an instructor of youth*, I have done you
"the justice uniformly to declare. You
"observed, at the time, as you do in your
"letter, that you had often prayed for him,
"or attempted so to do. In employing,
"therefore, the expression, *crush*, *over-*
"*whelm*, or *destroy him*, I considered you
"as referring to his *public agency*."

In this charitable and, I hope I ma add, liberal construction of your feeling and motives, as well as in certain other kind sentiments which it was both my pride and my pleasure to cherish in relation to you, I have reason to apprehend that I was radically mistaken.

A love of religion and a zeal for the glory of God, unalloyed by human passion, never impel a christian to extremes. In a particular manner, they never infuse

into him malignity of purpose, nor inflame him to such a degree of intemperate resentment against a supposed offender, as to make him attempt his immolation by persecution and slander. They augment towards the delinquent his compassion and benevolence, and urge him to the exercise of his kindest offices and hig est energies, to convince him of his errors and effect his reformation.

But, compared with such a course, so irresistibly enjoined on every christian minister by the gospel which he preaches, what has been your conduct in relation to President Holley? Let your denunciations of him in the streets, your addresses from the pulpit, and the embittered pa ges of your theological journal, answer the question. If these sources do not in dicate in you, in relation to that officer, a spirit of deadly persecution rather than of human kindness or christian love, then must I, as well as every other individual with whom I have spoken on the subject, resign all pretension to interpret their meaning. In fine, sir, as long as you persist in your defamatory practices, any further effort by you to induce either the public or individuals to believe, that you foster towards Mr. Holley no sentiments of private hostility, and that while you slander his official character, you embrace him personally in the love of the Redeemer, and petition Heaven sincerely and devoutly for the salvation of his soul, will be regarded as the miserable cant of hypocrisy.

Should you carry into effect your resolution to publish, which honor, discretion, interest, and every other laudable consideration forbids, *this letter* which constitutes a part of our correspondence, must appear with *the others*, as a suitable exposition of my present views of the entire subject to which they relate. You cannot be permitted dextrously to avail yourself of the favourable sentiments I once entertained of you, and frankly, and, I trust, civilly endeavoured to express to you, but which I have since had such ample reason to change.

But in case you abandon your intention to publish, dispose of this communication as you please. By my act it shall never, on that condition, be divulged, except as a consequence of some future and exceptionable conduct of your own. As I have repeatedly assured you, few occurrences could be more painful to me, than an impassioned controversy in the public prints. Nothing but motives of paramount influence shall ever exhibit me publicly to the community in the character and attitude of an intellectual pugillist. From some experience, permit me to warn you, that from such a conflict, the most successful combatant rarely retires in all respects as sound and unsullied as he entered it. This truth, as a young man but little versed in the affairs of life, it may be well for you to weigh with due deliberation, and draw from it the inference—the only inference which judgment warrants and discretion approves.

You complain of me bitterly, as if I had been guilty of a breach of trust, on account of my having given to a friend a very brief extract from one of the letters of our correspondence *written by myself*, the substance of which, you well know, I was in the daily practice of mentioning in conversation. I say the letter, from which the extract was taken, was *written by myself*. Those written *by you* have been seen only by me, nor have their contents been divulged to any individual. The transaction specified you now adduce as a justification, on your part, for publishing the entire correspondence. The insufficiency of this *excuse* (for it is nothing more) a very brief analysis will expose.

You cannot have forgotten that, by your own acknowledgement, *all* the letters, of the correspondence—*mine* as well as *yours*—were exhibited *by you* to Dr. Fishback, at a time when, under a vile attempt to suborn one of my pupils *as a spy*, to collect information for him, he was endeavouring to possess himself of materials to injure me.

For this act of yours, the legitimate name of which, let others affix to it, the mere furnishing of a friend *by me* with a short extract from one of the letters written by myself, was but a slight retaliation. It was indeed, no retaliation at all; nor can any thing short of an exposure of *your letters* be so denominated.

What I communicated to you in writing, unless it had been done under an express stipulation of secresy, (and in the transaction refered to, no secresy was either enjoined or intended) I had a right to communicate to any other individual, either in writing or conversation. Of

such proceeding by me, neither usage nor reason gives you cause to complain.

The whole correspondence, unless it had been conducted under some express or implied understanding to the contrary, might be used, at pleasure, either by you or myself, *in any way short of actual publication*. This, I am told, is the *law* on the subject; and to this effect, I know, was a late decision given by a very high and enlightened tribunal.

Of the subject matter of the correspondence you may converse freely. So may I. Written extracts or entire copies of the letters either you or I may furnish to others, and neither of us have ground of serious complaint. But without my consent, you have no right to *print and publish my* letters; nor I to *print and publish yours*, without your consent. If any consideration other than the consent of the parties gives authority to publish, it must arise out of the approach or pressure of some calamity, which the publication would prevent or remove.

To this you answer, that the gentleman who writes for the Western Monitor, under the signature of "Observer," has quoted and published a few sentences from the extract of my letter in such a garbled way, as to do you injustice and injure your reputation.

I reply, that "Observer" did not procure the materials from me; nor did I give them away under the slightest expectation that he would ever see them. But to remedy this evil, and silence all complaint in relation to it, I have already given you permission, which I now renew, to use at your pleasure, the whole of the extract to which reference is made. That no mistake may occur with regard to it, I here present it to you at full length.

"You stated to me specifically, that "ever since your return from the East, "you had done every thing in your power "to "put down" (such I think were the "terms used) the President of the Uni- "versity; that you considered it your du- "ty to continue your efforts to the same "effect; and that if you had had *five hun- "dred sons*, you would, in imitation of the "father of Hannibal, compel them to "swear, if, you added, it were not a crime "to swear, to follow your example" (*of "eternal enmity to Mr. Holley.*)

"You further observed, that a combin- "ed attack was about to be opened on "the President, (for his destruction was "represented, I think, as the sole object "of the united effort) of such force as "must inevitably *overwhelm*, *crush*, or *de- "stroy* him. One of these three strong "terms was employed by you to express "what you anticipated as the indubitable "issue of the impending conflict."

"As *allies* or *parties* in this combination, "you distinctly mentioned the Presbyte- "rian and Baptist denominations of chris- "tians"

This is the whole of the extract furnished by me, and I place it at your disposal.

The quoted and italicized line in the last paper by "Observer" "*you have prayed or attempted to pray for him.*" (Mr. Holley) is not in the extract. That writer must have, therefore, derived it from some other quarter. It is altogether probable that he may have received it from some one (possibly from myself if he has ever met me) through the medium of conversation. Most assuredly he did not gain possession of it by any disclosure, on my part, of our late correspondence.

My reluctance to the publication of this correspondence does not arise from its containing a single sentiment which I wish to conceal. Such as it is, the world is welcome to it. To myself individually I think the publication of it would be perhaps beneficial. But I am utterly averse from appearing before the public in the character of a controversalist.

If. therefore, you publish more of the correspondence that the preceding extract, publish it *entire*, this letter constituting a part of it. I will not consent to any mutilation of it, or extract from it, other than that already indicated.

You tell me that you hold a certificate from the Reverend Mr. ——— testifying that the conversation held in his presence, by you and myself, was different from the report which I have given of it.

I answer definitively, that I disregard alike all certificates and verbal statements made on that subject. Without impeaching the veracity or undervaluing the character of the Reverend gentleman who was present on the occasion, (for, to speak with frankness, I formed a favoura-

ble opinion of him,) I confide in my own recollection rather than in his. As to ideas and events my memory has rarely if ever deceived me; and the conversation having been directed to myself, and being of a nature most deeply to interest me, there is good cause to believe, that I was the most attentive listener, in the room.

For these reasons (proclaim me vain and presumptuous if you please) I prefer, in relation to the conversation refered to, my own recollection to all other earthly testimony; and for the correctness of my report of it, I dare appeal to the records of Heaven.

On my part, this communication closes, perhaps, forever our literary correspondence. On the eve of a journey, and busied in making arrangements for it, if you even address to me a reply requiring a rejoinder, I shall not prepare it.

Whether I shall be hereafter your enemy, your friend, or an entire stranger to you, will depend on yourself. Should nothing further be done by you to excite me, what has been already done will soon be forgotten. But I am irrevocably friendly to literature in the west, and shall not be likely to regard with indifference a contumacious continuation of your *jealous* and *unnatural* efforts to check its progress. Although those around you may be educated like yourself, wherefore are you *disquieted? Do you dread competitors?* In the words of the poet, which are no doubt familiar to you, will you

"too fond to rule alone,"
"Bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne?"
View him with scornful, yet with *jealous* eyes,
And *damn for arts which caused yourself to rise?*

To say nothing of your meekness as a christian pastor, your patriotism and magnanimity as a man ought to extinguish in you all such grovelling and ignominious sentiments. Amid rivalship *alone*, is distinction honourable. Toil for reputation, then, with all your energies; but do not any longer, like Thersites or Zoilus, aim at the attainment of it by the defamation of others.

In the hope that you will learn to live peacefully yourself and abandon the unmanly and unchristian practice of disturbing the peace and tranquility of your neighbours, I wish you sincerely health, happiness, and longevity, and am very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,
April 2d, 1825. CH: CALDWELL.
The Revd. John Breckinridge.

N. B. Unless the Rev. Mr. Breckinridge complies with the conditions stated in this communication, he will have the goodness to return it, according to arrangement, at as early a period as may suit his convenience.

In that case Dr. Caldwell will feel himself at liberty to publish it, with such additional observations as the occassion may require. But he repeats that, although *at liberty* to publish, he will not avail himself of that liberty, unless the measures adopted by Mr. Breckinridge render it necessary.

MR. HENDERSON'S CERTIFICATE.

Having been at the house of the Rev. J. Breckinridge, when a conversation was held between him and Dr. C. Caldwell in which several topics were introduced, and some important questions discussed; and having been requested by Mr. Breckinridge to say whether the name of the Rev. Dr. Fishback was mentioned in the conversation or not; and, also, whether he (Mr. B.) said, in the conversation, that there was a combination formed between the Baptists and the Presbyterians, to crush the President of Transylvania University: I declare sincerely that I do not recollect to have heard the name of Dr. Fishback mentioned in the said conversation, nor to have heard Mr. B. say that there was a combination formed between the Baptists and the Presbyterians. Mr. B. did speak of a combination of Baptists against the President, but not of Baptists and Presbyterians, unless I have misunderstood what he said, or have forgotten a part of the conversation, to which I must have paid some attention. I shall not pretend to state his words precisely; but, I think, the substance of one of his sentences was as follows: There is a combination forming against the President which will crush him. He certainly was speaking of Baptists, but, I am persuaded that he did not name the Presbyterians in that part of the conversation. And I am not disposed to think that he intended to intimate either that the Presbyterians, as a body, or

himself as an individual, formed a part of the combination.

WILLIAM HENDERSON.

Feb. 11, 1825.

Lexington, April 18th, 1825.

During the latter part of the month of January last, Dr. Charles Caldwell called upon me at an early hour of the morning—and in the presence of my family—as well as of several friends—after the ordinary civilities had been interchanged, introduced a late Lecture which he had pronounced before the medical class, on natural religion, as the subject of conversation. He stated that this exhibition of his views of religion had been grossly and slanderously misrepresented by a certain gentleman in the town, and inquired of me whether I had heard it spoken of as designed to depreciate the religion of the Bible. I replied that though I did not hear him pronounce it, I had been induced to believe, upon the combined testimony of many persons, ladies and gentlemen, laymen and clergymen, and of medical students themselves, that it was an attempt to establish a system of deism—by substituting natural religion for the religion of Jesus Christ. He then, after disclaiming this as his intention—asked if I would, upon his mention of a certain name, say whether the individual who bore it had not been especially active in making to me this communication. I at once declined—and thus prevented farther inquiry as to the individual—and the conversation on this subject closed, with a passing argument, which convinced me that Dr. Caldwell's views had not been misrepresented—though he charged the supposed author with slander and falsehood. Our interview closed with mutual and free remarks on the religious and official character of President Holley, &c. &c.

It was in consequence of receiving information that Dr. Caldwell had misstated to the President the latter part of our conversation, that I addressed to him the first letter in the foregoing series. After this, communications were exchanged in succession until my third letter was left without a reply. The correspondence thus closed, with the certificate of Mr. Henderson, will speak for itself without the necessity of any comment or explanation. After the lapse of nearly two months, an unprincipled and personal attack was made on me, by a writer, (or rather as it is believed a combination of writers)—signing himself "Observer," in whose pieces there were not only repeated allusions to my conversation with Dr. Caldwell, but to the correspondence growing out of it; and in the last of this series of scurrilous papers, an actual and so far as it proceeded a literal extract from one of the letters. In consequence of these facts, I addressed to Dr. Caldwell the following note, stating my determination to publish the whole correspondence.

"Sir,—The repeated perversions of our late conversation concerning President Holley, &c. &c. both in print, and in the private intercourse of the citizens of the town, make it necessury that our correspondence on that subject be given to the public.

I feel it to be a duty to inform you of this determination.

The incidental mention which you make of Dr. Fishback's name, with your severe strictures on his course in reference to the Transylvania University, would make me hesitate as to the propriety of this step, did I not know, that you have expressed the same views still more strongly before your whole class—and that you have communicated them directly by letter to him. I therefore indulge the hope that you will consider it no violation of your rights on this subject, thus to do myself the justice usually claimed on such occasions

I remain, your ob't. ser't. J. B."

To this he sent no answer; but meeting me a few hours afterwards in the streets entered into conversation on the subject of my intention thus announced to him. In that interview he owned that he had given to some one an extract from our correspondence. He averred that it was not to "Observer," and not for publication—yet on being asked "why it had been given," he refused a reply, but acknowledged that he had *not forbidden such a use* as had been made of the extracted paragraph.

Four days after this interview (though dated for the same day) the long and extraordinary letter which closes the preceding series was addressed to me by Dr. Caldwell, with a demand that it should appear as a part of the correspondence, if I persisted in making it public. I therefore give it with the original letters, though it has no more than an arbitary connection with them. It was put into the possession of Mr. Curry for insertion with them in his paper, but on the passage of the Monitor into other hands it was refused admission into its columns by his successor. Such is a succinct history of the origin of this unpleasant publication. It must we think be seen at a glance by every impartial and honourable mind, that my course on this occasion has been not only proper but necessary.

It is in vain for Dr. Caldwell to attempt to cast upon me the dishonour of having first exposed a private correspondence. The successive letters palpably discover that he *first* communicated our private conversation, with an addition of a name which was not mentioned by me, to the President of the college—and that he did in it attribute to me statements which by the certificate of the Rev. Mr. Henderson are *proved* never to have been uttered. And then he adds to this the injustice of giving an extract from the correspondence which his misrepresentation of the conversation had produced—giving it without my knowledge or consent—giving it without prohibiting the publication, and giving it without being willing to satisfy me as to his reasons for furnishing it. He tells me that it was in retaliation for my exposure of the correspondence in private to some of my friends. Yet this fact was communicated to him by me, after the paper in which these extracts *were published had been put into circulation*, i. e. he retaliates, *before he is informed* of the injury which had been done him. Again, it is of no avail so say, as he does, that the extract was from *his letter* and not *mine*. For as it *was an account of my remarks*, and *as I had complained to him of his misstatement of them*, it was not the less but the *more unjust* to give the quotation from his letter and not from mine.

The charge of hostility to the progress of letters in the west is too palpably absurd to require any answer, until it shall appear that letters will die with the President of the University and his Quixotic friend; and the evidence before the public of my *blighted hopes*, and melancholy failures in the service of the church, is unanswerable as the fact, that I have forfeited the favour of these illustrious Deists.

Seldom, has the public eye been invited to the perusal of a more virulent and undignified production than the last letter of Dr. Caldwell. Never did a man calling himself great appear in an attitude more unenviably small. For my own part I am satisfied to leave this ribaldous production though designed to conteract the dreaded effects of the correspondence and certificate to make its own way—and by contrast to speak for me. Dr. Caldwell informs me in the close of his last communication that he is about to leave the state.—I too am upon the eve of departure from it. Whether these strictures may by him be esteemed of sufficient importance to *deserve his* notice, the future must determine. For myself,

as I have been in all the stages of this affair a defensive agent, so I shall at any time to come hold myself in readiness to repel aggression and defend the truth.

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

N. B. It is due to myself to say that I proposed to Dr. Caldwell to omit in the publication those parts of his letters which refered to Dr Fishback--and that he insisted on their insertion if any more were made public than the brief extract which he recommends in the last letter.

THE LUMINARY.

LEXINGTON:

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1825.

We owe an apology to our readers for occupying our pages so extensively to day with what many may deem a mere personal and uninteresting concern. From its close connection however with the affairs of the Transylvania University, we think it of importance in *itself*—and a perusal of the letters with the accompanying remarks upon them, will shew the propriety and use in regard to *ourselves*.

We shall close in this No. our inquiry into the state of the institution—believing that enough has now been said to make known to the community the principal facts upon the subject. Nothing can be more important to the country than this subject—and we are persuaded that the enlightened and christian reader has not grown weary of attending to so momentous a concern.

TRANSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY.

We have now said the substance of what truth and duty, in our judgment, called for, on the subject of reform in the Transylvania University. Though several particulars, in addition, might have been introduced with propriety at this time, yet we shall close our investigation into these important concerns with a few brief suggestions.

As to the plan of reform suggested by Dr. Fishback—

We think the principles which he assumes are sound and important, viz. that the Board of Trustees should be independent of local or of personal influences, that it should in some degree represent the various christian denominations of the state, and that it should be so constituted as on the one hand to assemble the collective wisdom of the state, and on the other to retain the power of speedy collection and of efficient action.

The sum of our suggestions on this subject is, that the *Board of Trustees should govern the President, and not the president the Board.* So long as the board is made up of individuals who almost to a man live within or just around Lexington—so long as the *supreme authority* of this body thus made *local* is brought into constant exercise by monthly and call meetings for doing business—so long as there is not a higher tribunal on which the election of its Trustees and of the college professors finally depends, and to which its last appeals are to be made, just so long will the president govern the board in all its vital acts—and so long will the spirit of the institution be in its nature local.

We make no insinuations against the motives of this honorable body. Many of our personal friends are enrolled upon its catalogue, and we would be very far from making these suggestions personal. The evil which we speak of, arises not only or principally, or perhaps not *at all*, from the *personal* character of the members, but from the mode of their constitution as a body, from their locality, from their liability to constant intrigues and undue influences, or else as the only alternative

to constant conflicts. The President in such a state of things will always impress his own character on the acts and corporate character of the Board. If its members dissent from his system whatever it be, they must either retire from the body, submit, or in vain struggle with superior power. The first is the course for the most part pursued—the second is a guilty betrayal of truth and public interest, and the third useless and painful in the extreme. In most of the institutions of the nation with which we are acquainted there is a quorum of the board for necessary business resident at the institution.—This quorum meet only under pro-re-nata, or exigent calls, and their acts are all referable to and pass under review by the whole board at two semi-annual meetings The members selected are from all the professions—men of high standing, and representives of the various local and professional and religious influences, on which the institution depends.

Dr. Fishback's plan, to have an executive Board on the ground, and a Board of overseers collected from the state, is in amount the same, and if properly arranged might equally well meet the necessities of the case.

The objection to it seems to be the danger of being too cumbrous, and of having its influence destroyed by diffusion. We drop these hasty hints, as due to the subject—but we have not much hope that the evils complained of will be rectified until the voice of the people speaks aloud; until, as the *source of power*, and as the proprietors of the University, THE PEOPLE DEMAND REFORM. May God in his mercy speed that day—that day we believe is just at hand—

"These coming events cast their shadows before."

For ourselves we here most solemnly declare that we personally wish well to the President of the Transylvania University. We are unconscious of an evil feeling or unkind wish toward him. We will not stoop to answer the chargeswhichhave been by himself and others levelled against us, of *enmity to the town*, or *emnity to the college*. We will leave the issue to the decision of the rapidly approaching future. "*Time is the friend of truth.*" We are willing to meet the President and his friends before our country and before our God on the great question involved in this discussion. Before both these tribunals we must soon appear. There it will be seen who have erred —who have been the friends of the institution, the people, and the truth, and who have contributed to the destruction of them all.

We have a closing sentence in regard to this paper. Many threats have been made against us for opening our columns on the University question. It was said to one of our friends in the town a few days since, "the people of Lexington do not know their own interests if they will permit the Western Luminary to exist here after its exposure of the affairs of Transylvania University." If this be the spirit of the friends of the University, what are the people to expect from it? "Are we its enemy because we have told the truth?" If the statements and arguments held up to view are false, let better arguments and statements prove them so. If true, receive and use them for the public good. We have mistaken the spirit of the people of Kentucky if they would *put down* a press *which dares to tell the truth.* We are willing to rest our existence as a press upon the public judgment. In 9 months our list of subscribers has grown from 575 to 900—and we believe that the christians of the west will not leave the paper to perish for such a cause—that the distinguished patronage already extended to it, will not be withdrawn to gratify the malig-

nity of those "who hate the light, and will not *come* to the light lest their deeds should be reproved." We have at all times redeemed the pledge we gave at first, that it should not be a *sectarian paper*—and that it should not be our *business* or our *leading object* to assail any institution; yet in common will all other editors we should when duty called expose corruption, institute inquiry into existing evils, and fearlessly display the "banner of the Lord." No other pledge has been, or could be given. To have asked another would have been to confess a state of things which made investigation into the concerns of the institution our duty.

Another interesting letter from a little Chickasaw girl, to a young lady in this town.

Monroe, Chickasaw Nation,
March 3, 1825.

Dear friend,

I take my pen in my hand to tell you about this school, that the scholars are learning fast. When I came to this school I could neither read nor write, but now I can read and write, but not a very good hand. I am reading in the Bible and spell in the Dictionary and studying English Grammer. We have a very fine teacher; he came from a very far country to teach poor Indians to pray, so that they may not go down to destruction. I hope that we may learn to read God's word and pray to him, that we may now turn from our sins, that we may go to heaven and sing God's word, but if we do not try we will go down to hell where we will never rest day nor night. The Judgment day is very near at hand, and then we will have to come before the Judge and give an account for our sins. If we go to hell once we will never get out of that lake that burns with fire and brimstone, and all the whole world will be burnt up by fire and all that is in it, and all the nations that forget God.

Dear friend, I wish you would pray me.

Your affectionate friend,
FRANCIS C. BAILEY.

Amanda Taylor.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

More Good News from India.—Mr. Leslie, a Baptist missionary in India, writes from Calcutta, under date of June 7, 1824 that much good is doing at Madras. At one of the stations of the Church Missionaries, there has been a great outpouring of the Spirit; and in one school 23, out of 30 youths, give evidence of sincere conversion.—Mr. L. attended a monthly meeting of all the missionaries at Madras in April last; at which 11 were present, from different societies and different countries. "All stated," says Mr. L. "that idolatry is beginning to sit very loosely upon the people.—Many of the converts have suffered great persecution for Christ's sake; and, in some places, even Christian villages exist. The people themselves are beginning to dispute with the Brahmins on the absurdities of Hindooism, and, on one occasion, a Brahmin was so confounded with some questions of the people concerning God, that he had to confess his ignorance; at which they, (in number about 400 or 500) called to a missionary, who was standing by, to come and teach them concerning the Deity. This we heard from the missionary himself."—*Southern Intelligencer.*

From the Boston Courier, March 18.

Trouble in the Sandwich Islands.—A gentleman of this town has favoured us with the following extract of a letter from his correspondent at the Sandwich Islands, dated

"*Wha-hoo, Sept.* 8, 1824.

"Tamoree, late King of Atooi, died 26th of last May, and the Island having been formerly ceded to Rhio Rhio, was taken possession of by Krymakoo as regent. The Atooi chiefs were

exceedingly dissatisfied with the cession of their Island in the first instance, and were held in subjection only by their king being kept here as a hostage. This dissatisfaction was increased by an unpopular Governor being set over them, and by other acts; and on Sunday the 8th of August, some of the Atooi people, with George Tomaree at their head, made an attack on the fort, with the intention of seizing the arms and ammunition.

"The attack was ill planned, and was consequently unsuccesful. They were repulsed, and about twenty men and one or two chiefs left dead. Krymakoo, with Tamahamaha the new governor, shut themselves up in the fort and despatched their vessels for assistance. Since this time the Islands have been in a perfect turmoil. All business is at end, except the war; the vessels have been all kept in requisition to carry troops, and the natives are all the time training and firing off their guns.—When Krymakoo had about 1000 or 1500 natives, and many chiefs, from the Windward Islands, he marched out of his fort and attacked the Atooi people in their intrenchments. The latter were beaten and retreated, leaving many dead. George retired to the mountains with only a few followers, and the troops of the governor set out to scour the Island. Since then the war has become almost one of extermination, and has been prosecuted with savage barbarity. The hills are covered with dead bodies, the lands laid waste, and the houses burned. George is in the mountains, and is said to have about 600 natives with him, but they must suffer for want of provisions, as the Island is ruined, and will probably be obliged to submit in the course of a month."

A great Traveller.—Capt. Benjamin Worth, says the Nantucket Inquirer, sailed from this port in the year 1783, and has continued in various maritime employments till the year 1824, being 41 years; seven only of which he has passed at home. During this period (34 years) he has made the following voyages:

One to London; four to the Coast of Guinea; five to the Brazils and Africa; eight to the Pacific Ocean; one to the West Indies; one to the Grand Bank; one to the N. W. Coast and Canton; in accomplishing which, he has sailed by computation, 879,960 miles! He has passed Cape Horn 16 times; the Cape of Good Hope twice; circumnavigated the globe twice; visited nearly all the ports on the coasts of Chili and Peru; the N. W. coast of America, New-Holland, New-Zealand, Canton, and more than forty Islands in the Southern Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; obtained fifteen thousand barrels of spermaceti oil, and four thousand barrels whale oil—never having had a man killed on board of his vessel, nor a bone of one of his men broken by a whale.

——:o:o:o:o:——

LINES,

WRITTEN IN A COMMON PLACE BOOK.

See to your book, young lady; let it be
An index to your life—each page be pure,
By vanity uncoloured, and by vice
Unspotted. Cheerful be each modest leaf,
Not rude; and pious be each written page.
Without hypocrisy, be it devout.
Without moroseness, be it serious.
If sportive—innocent. And if a tear
Blot its white margin, let it drop for those
Whose wickedness needs pity more than hate.
Hate *no one*—hate their *vices*, not themselves,
Spare many leaves for charity--that flower
That better than the rose's first white bud
Becomes a woman's bosom. There we seek,
And there we find it first. Such be your book
And such, young lady, always may you be.

Conn. Mirror.